

Appln No. 10/728,809  
Amdt. Dated August 05, 2004  
Response to Office action of June 08, 2004

2

### REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Applicant thanks Examiner for the detailed Office Action dated June 8, 2004.  
In response to the issues raised, the Applicant offers the following submissions.

#### **Claims 1, 2, 11 and 12 – 35 USC §103 Obviousness**

Claims 1, 2, 11 and 12 stand rejected as obvious in light of US 5,601,389 to Minami.

The Applicant respectfully submits that Minami does meet the basic requirements of a *prima facie* case of obviousness. One of the three basic criteria necessary to establish obviousness is – “the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all of the claim limitations” (see MPEP §2143). Minami fails to disclose or suggest a page binder that applies adhesive to the trailing edge extending transverse to the paper path. In fact the citation does not recognize any page binding arrangement other than printing the pages in portrait format and spraying adhesive from a fixed nozzle adjacent the paper path to the collection station.

To modify Minami to incorporate the limitations of claims 1 and 11 would require a substantial change to its basic principles of operation. To apply adhesive to the trailing edge of the pages is only practical for printing in a landscape orientation. Minami is silent as to the faster print speeds from pagewidth printing in landscape orientation. It is this benefit that motivates the present invention. Furthermore, the simultaneous application of the entire strip of adhesive is mechanically very different to applying a line of adhesive as the paper passes a nozzle. These distinctions involve many new design considerations as discussed in the present application from p.5, ln 26 to p.6, ln 20. Accordingly, there is no motivation or incentive for the ordinary worker to derive the present invention from Minami.

Therefore, claims 1, 2, 11 and 12 are clearly not obvious in light of Minami.

Appl. No. 10/728,809  
Amdt. Dated August 05, 2004  
Response to Office action of June 08, 2004

3

**Claims 3-10 and 13, 15, 18, 20 and 21 – 35 USC §103 Obviousness**

Claims 3-5, 10, 13, 15, 18 and 21 stand rejected as obvious in light of US 5,601,389 to Minami in view of US 2,707,632 to Daneke.

The Applicant respectfully disagrees. The combination of the Minami and Daneke disclosures still fails to teach or suggest all the claim limitations. As claims 3-5, 10, 13, 15, 18 and 21 are appended, directly or indirectly, to claims 1 or 11, the cited references fail to disclose or suggest a page binder that applies adhesive to the trailing edge extending transverse to the paper path.

Likewise the further addition of US 2,650,109 to Johnson, to the disclosures of Minami and Daneke, fails to teach the application of adhesive to the trailing issue. Accordingly, they fail to render claims 6-9 and 20 obvious by virtue of their appendence from claims 1 or 11.

It is respectfully submitted that the Examiner's rejections have been successfully traversed. Accordingly, reconsideration and allowance of the application is courteously solicited.

Very respectfully,

Applicant:



KIA SILVERBROOK

C/o:

Silverbrook Research Pty Ltd  
393 Darling Street  
Balmain NSW 2041, Australia

Email:

kia.silverbrook@silverbrookresearch.com

Telephone:

+612 9818 6633

Facsimile:

+61 2 9555 7762